FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

AUG - 9 2017

SUSAN Y. SOONG

Case No. CR United States of America, STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME Plaintiff, UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT UNTIL AUGUST 22, 2017 David Martin Escobar Defendant. the Court excludes time under the For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on and finds that the ends of justice served Speedy Trial Act from Avance 9, to Avalust &2 by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s): Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] ____ the number of defendants, ____ the nature of the prosecution, or ____ the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). -Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: \(\forall \) United States Magistrate Judge STIPULATED: Assistant United States Attorney